

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1	BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD	1
M.1.1	Award Selection	1
M.1.2	Number of Contracts to be Awarded	2
M.1.3	Rejection of Unrealistic Offers	2
M.1.4	Correction Potential of Proposals	2
M.1.5	Downselect Decision	2
M.1.6	Evaluation Order of Importance	3
M.1.7	Eligibility for Award	3
M.1.8	Successive Price Negotiations	3
M.2	EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD	3
M.3	EVALUATION PROCESS	4
M.3.1.1	Volume I, Business and Technical Management Proposal	5
M.3.1.1.1	Notice	9
M.3.1.1.2	Scoring	9
M.3.1.1.3	Risk Assessment	9
M.3.1.2	Volume II, Price Proposal Evaluation	10
M.3.1.2.1	Completeness and Accuracy	10
M.3.1.2.2	Price Realism	11
M.3.1.2.3	Price Reasonableness	11
M.3.1.2.4	Cost Risk	11
M.3.1.3	Volume III, Subcontracting Plan	11

M.1 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

M.1.1 AWARD SELECTION

This source selection will be conducted in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Acquisition Management System (AMS). This is a competitive source procurement in which price considerations are slightly more important than non-price related factors. This source selection will be based on a best value trade-off approach. Accordingly, award will be made to the responsible and technically acceptable Offeror whose proposal provides the greatest overall value to the FAA. This best-value determination will be accomplished by comparing the value of the differences in the technical factors for competing offers, based on their strengths, weaknesses, and risks, with differences in their price offered to the FAA. In making this comparison, the FAA does not intend to make an award to an Offeror who proposes a significantly higher overall price to achieve slightly superior technical approach. Award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal is determined to represent the best value to the FAA.

Only Offerors that demonstrate acceptable submission to the FAA of all items in Section L of this solicitation (or amendments thereof) will be considered for award.

The best value decision will be based on the evaluation of the Offeror's Business & Technical Management Proposal, Price Proposal, and Subcontracting plan. The

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Source Evaluation Team (SET) will individually evaluate, and comparatively assess each of the Business & Technical Management evaluation factors and submit evaluation results to the Source Evaluation Board (SEB). The SEB will provide recommendations based on evaluation results to the Source Selection Official (SSO) who will make a final award decision in accordance with AMS 3.2.2.3.1.2.5.

While the SET, SEB, and SSO will strive for maximum objectivity, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. The FAA reserves the right to make an award based on initial submittals. Offerors may be required to provide additional information. Should the FAA not make an award based on initial submittals, the FAA reserves the right to conduct successive round(s) of price negotiations. Successive negotiations may be conducted by way of, but not limited to, “Final Proposal Revision (FPR)” and/or an on-line reverse auction.

M.1.2 NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED

The FAA reserves the right to award one or more contracts, if it is in the best interest of the FAA. However, the FAA also reserves the right not to award a contract.

M.1.3 REJECTION OF UNREALISTIC OFFERS

The FAA may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program requirements, contract terms and conditions, or pricing, when compared to FAA estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence and/or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

M.1.4 CORRECTION POTENTIAL OF PROPOSALS

The FAA will consider, throughout the evaluation, the “correction potential” of any proposal uncertainty. The judgment of such “correction potential” is within the sole discretion of the FAA. If an aspect of an Offeror’s proposal not meeting the FAA’s requirements is not considered correctable, the Offeror may be eliminated from further consideration for award.

M.1.5 DOWNSELECT DECISION

Pursuant to the AMS, the FAA reserves the right to make one or more downselections during this evaluation process. A downselect decision will be limited to those Offerors determined to be most likely to receive the award. If at any point during the evaluation process the FAA concludes that an Offeror does not have a reasonable chance of receiving this award, the FAA may eliminate that Offeror from further consideration for award. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing by the Contracting Officer within five business days after decision is made.

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1.6 EVALUATION ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

There are three Volumes required for submission. There are three factors (including multiple sub-factors) of various weights in Volume I (Business and Technical Management) that will be evaluated separately from Volume II (Price Proposal) and Volume III (Subcontracting Plan). The total price in the Price Proposal is slightly more important than the total score for the Business and Technical Management Proposal. The Offeror's Subcontracting Plan must be acceptable (rated "pass") in order for the Offeror to be considered for award.

M.1.7 ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD

The Offeror must be financially viable and otherwise responsible in accordance with the FAA (AMS) guidelines. To be eligible for award, the Offeror must be technically and financially capable of performing the magnitude and scope of the work.

M.1.8 SUCCESSIVE PRICE NEGOTIATIONS

The FAA reserves the right to conduct successive price negotiations, and this may be by way of requesting final proposal revision and/or by an on-line reverse auction.

M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Evaluation of all Offerors will be made in accordance with the criteria outlined in this section. The proposals will be evaluated against the following factors/sub-factors:

NON PRICE FACTORS are as follows:

Factor 1 Management Approach

Sub-Factor 1	Customer Service
Sub-Factor 2	Teaming Strategy
Sub-Factor 3	License and Maintenance Tracking Tool
Sub-Factor 4	Quality Assurance
Sub-Factor 5	Supply Chain Risk Management

Factor 2 Technical Approach

Sub-Factor 1	CONUS and OCONUS Delivery
Sub-Factor 2	Web Portal
Sub-Factor 3	Business Intelligence
Sub-Factor 4	Configuration Management

Factor 3 Relevant Experience / Past Performance

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Sub-Factor 1	Relevant Past Performance
Sub-Factor 2	Contract Performance

The Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated separately as pass/fail. The Price Proposal will be evaluated separately and applied in the determination of best value.

The rated technical evaluation criteria are slightly less important than price. As relative technical advantages and disadvantages become less distinct, a difference in price between proposals is of increased importance in determining the most advantageous proposal. Conversely, as differences in price become less distinct, differences in relative technical advantages and disadvantages among proposals are of increased importance in the determination.

M.3 EVALUATION PROCESS

The FAA will evaluate the ability of each Offeror and the likelihood of its proposed approach to satisfy its requirements outlined in Section C the Statement of Work (SOW). The evaluation of each proposal will include, at a minimum, written proposals (initial and revisions) and discussions. The evaluation process consists of an evaluation of the responses to the Business and Technical Management Proposal (Volume I) and the Price Proposal (Volume II). The FAA will use proposal content, discussions, past performance. The FAA reserves the right to contact Offeror's customers or other sources for information not specifically provided. The FAA will exercise business judgment and maximum discretion in evaluating all information collected.

Proposals shall be prepared in accordance with the instructions in Section L. If a proposal is not prepared in accordance with Section L, it will be determined to be non-responsive. Assumptions, trade-offs and risks should be clear throughout the proposal, and risk mitigation strategies presented proactively.

The FAA intends to utilize the following high-level steps in performing its evaluation:

1. Evaluation of Initial Proposals. Proposals will be reviewed and evaluated on the three technical factors and sub-factors described in Section M.
2. Initial Cost Evaluation. Price proposal will be evaluated as described in Section M, Cost Evaluation.
3. Successive Price Negotiations. At the Contracting Officer's discretion, the FAA may elect to request a final proposal revision, and/ or by conducting an online reverse auction.
4. Discussions. At the Contracting Officer's discretion, the FAA may conduct written and oral discussions with the Offeror at any time after the downselect determination through the submission of final proposals.
5. Final Proposal Revision (formerly referred to as Best and Final Offer). The Offeror will be given the opportunity to submit final proposal revisions after the conclusion of discussions.

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

6. Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions. Final proposal revisions will be evaluated against the evaluation factors and a best value trade-off determination will be made.
7. Source Selection and Contract Award

The technical evaluation will be achieved through a determination and an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, and risks of each proposal. Technical risks will be included in the final evaluation of each factor and will not be evaluated as a separate factor. In the assessment of technical risk, the FAA evaluators will consider all available information.

The results of the technical evaluation and the computed price of each proposal will be provided to the Source Selection Official (SSO) to support the award decision.

M.3.1.1 Volume I, Business and Technical Management Proposal

The Offeror's response in the Business and Technical Management Proposal shall demonstrate the appropriateness of the techniques, methods and processes the Offeror plans to use to successfully accomplish the requirements specified in Section C. The Offeror will also demonstrate how they will achieve the administrative, technical, logistical, and managerial requirements of the statement of work. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which it demonstrates a clear understanding of the SIR. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable and whether the Offeror's methods and approach in meeting the requirements in a timely manner provide the FAA with a high level of confidence of successful completion. Offerors should add any additional information deemed appropriate to demonstrate their knowledge of the evaluation factor and their capabilities to perform.

Three factors will be considered in the evaluation of Volume I.

FACTOR 1 – MANAGEMENT APPROACH (35%) – The Offeror's technical approach will be evaluated by assessing the likelihood that the Offeror's proposed technical approach will meet the FAA's requirements, including any associated risk of the Offeror's non-performance in the technical approach.

The Sub-Factors for this Factor will be used to evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach demonstrates a clear understanding, meets all requirements and challenges of the requirement. The FAA will evaluate the Offeror's response to the Sub-Factors identified below:

- Sub-factor 1. Customer Service (C.5.12, C.5.13): Describe your customer service program. Include information on items such as
- requests for technical assistance,
 - quote preparation,
 - status of orders,

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

- delivery verification, etc.
- (1 page maximum)

Sub-factor 2. Teaming Strategy. Your submission must describe an integrated, thoughtful, and effective approach that your company intends to employ during the contract period of performance. This teaming strategy reflects how your company will ensure compliance to the performance parameters outlined in the SOW Section C.5.18 through established procedures that necessitate the management of partner relationships. At a minimum the teaming strategy must address the following:

- The anticipated participants and any final agreements that may be utilized to conduct routine interfaces, minimize disconnects, and maintain performance
- The duties, strengths, areas, and functions that the partner will play in performance of the contract
- Management processes and procedures that will benefit the contract (e.g., customer service, schedules, costs, reliability)

(3 page maximum)

Sub-factor 3. License and Maintenance Tracking Tool (C.5.22) The Offeror must provide a description of and how it supports the following activities associated with this requirement:

- viewing of products, service terms/levels, entitlements, coverage timeframes, expirations, uncovered assets, gaps in coverage;
- ability to manage multi-year contracts;
- reporting capabilities; and
- ability to export data for inclusion in Government tools and databases.

(2 page maximum)

Sub-factor 4. Quality Control (C.5.17): Describe a quality assurance procedure (e.g., checklists, audits, reviews) already in place for your company, its purpose, actions taken to ensure compliance and your performance measurements. If your company has ISO certification, please provide the date you were audited and found to be in compliance with the standard.

(1 page maximum)

Sub-factor 5. Supply Chain Risk Management (C.5.21): Describe how your company addresses supply chain risk management to ensure the Government's acquisition of safe and secure IT hardware and software. Supply chain risks include:

- natural hazards
- viruses
- data security
- demand variability
- supply fluctuations, etc.

(2 page maximum)

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

FACTOR 2 – TECHNICAL APPROACH (30%) – The Offeror's management approach will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror demonstrates that it has developed a strategy for the effective and efficient management of contract activities to successfully fulfill the requirements outlined in Section C. The FAA will evaluate the Offeror's description of its existing resources, assets, and competencies that it proposes to use to satisfy the requirements outlined in Section C.

Sub-factor 1. CONUS and OCONUS Delivery: Provide information on how your company will acquire and deliver products to DOT locations worldwide (Section F). Include information on the following:

- package inspection
- emergency orders
- on-time delivery performance
- compliance with shipping instructions
- and confirmation of receipt.

(1 page maximum)

Sub-factor 2. Web Portal: Demonstrate your company's capability for providing an Internet based Web portal (C.5.8) by providing a website address, guest logon name and password to a non-restricted custom website (i.e. beta site or available to any federal customers). At a minimum, the website should have the following capabilities:

- show sample products and prices
- provide informational documents and hyperlinks
- permit adding items to a shopping cart

(1 page maximum)

Sub-factor 3. Business Intelligence (C.5.6): What procedures and tools (reporting, analysis, forecasting) will be used by your company to help the Government to achieve greater efficiencies and taxpayer savings? Items for consideration:

- Opportunities for consolidation and reduction of costs
- Opportunities for strategic sourcing initiatives
- Lowering the total cost of ownership

(2 page maximum)

Sub-factor 4. Configuration Management: Describe how your company can help the Government achieve its goal of managing the configuration (C.5.2) of its IT hardware and allow for technology refresh or improvement (C.5.7).

(1 page maximum)

FACTOR 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE & RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (35%) –The Offeror must provide the extent and depth of corporate experience in performing the same or similar work as described in the SOW.

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Sub-factor 1. Past Performance. This sub-factor will be evaluated on the basis of the Offeror's relevant experience during the last five (5) years. The FAA will determine whether the Offeror's experience, including the planning and implementation, on contracts is similar in size, scope, and complexity to the SAVES IT Hardware requirement. The FAA reserves the right to contact outside references cited on the Relevant Experience / Past Performance questionnaire. Similar experience from current or previous contracts will be compared with the scope of work outlined in Section C.

The information presented in the Offeror's proposal, together with information from any other sources available to the FAA, will provide the primary input for evaluation of this factor. The FAA reserves the right to verify specifics of current or previous contracts described by the Offeror's proposal. The FAA also reserves the right to consider information from other sources that the Offeror has supported.

The FAA will evaluate the Offeror's similar experience as it relates to the requirements defined in Section C. Greater consideration will be given to technical solutions that demonstrate relevant experience from contracts of similar size, scope and complexity of this SAVES IT Hardware requirement. Past performance on contracts that are equal to or more technically relevant to the SAVES IT Hardware requirement and similar in size, scope and complexity will receive greater consideration than performance on contracts that are less relevant.

If the FAA receives, for a given Offeror, no Past Performance Questionnaires or only irrelevant questionnaires, the Offeror will be excluded from further consideration of award.

Sub-factor 2. Relevant Experience: Based on your past experience with contracts of similar complexity and scope, please describe how you track customer satisfaction and how you resolve performance issues such as:

- unresponsiveness to phone calls and emails
- late shipments
- price discrepancies
- reporting issues

Do you have an established and institutionalized approach?
(1 page maximum).

In general, contract performance will be evaluated on the extent of client satisfaction with the previous performance of the Offeror; the Offeror's effectiveness in managing and directing resources; the Offeror's demonstration of reasonable and cooperative behavior in dealing with clients; the Offeror's quality of previously performed services; the Offeror's ability manage contract activities; and the Offeror's effectiveness in meeting schedules in providing services and products.

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.3.1.1.1 Notice

The FAA will not consider information provided in the Proposal Introduction and Required Documents (Volume I) in the evaluation of Factors 1, 2, and 3 of the Business and Technical Management Proposal.

M.3.1.1.2 Scoring

For each question in the Factors listed above the Offeror will receive a numerical score from 0 to 5 (see table below). Each question has a weighted percentage. The scores from the questions in each factor will be summed and weighted percentages will be applied to the three factors to arrive at a final score.

NUMERICAL	DEFINITION
5	Greatly exceeds the minimum performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the FAA. There are no weaknesses.
4	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. Exceeds the minimum performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the FAA.
3	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or apparent or moderate weaknesses that are correctable. As a whole, weaknesses not offset by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response.
2	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses that are correctable. May meet the performance or capability requirements
1	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or unacceptable weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.
0	Proposal was incomplete or did not address criteria and considered non-responsive

M.3.1.1.3 Risk Assessment

During the course of the Business and Technical Management proposal evaluations, potential risks to the successful performance of the SIR requirements by the Offeror will be identified, reviewed, and assessed by the Evaluators. Risks identified within any aspect of an Offeror's proposal, and within any of the evaluation factors, will be assessed as to their potential impact on work performance, program management, work schedules, and cost. Additionally, risks identified due to inconsistencies and discrepancies between various aspects of each Offeror's proposal will also be evaluated. An overall adjectival rating describing the risk inherent in each Offeror's proposal will be assigned as follows:

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

High Risk: Great potential exists for serious work performance problems including, but not limited to, work schedule disruptions, degradation of performance or quality problems and increases in cost, even with special emphasis and close monitoring.

Medium Risk: Some potential exists for work performance problems including, but not limited to, work schedule disruptions, degradation of performance or quality problems, and a commensurate increase in contract costs incurred by the Government. However, with special emphasis and close monitoring by the Government, the Contractor will probably be able to overcome the difficulties.

Low Risk: Minimal or no potential exists for work performance problems, including, but not limited to, work schedule disruptions, quality problems, and a limited or no increase in contract costs incurred by the Government. Any difficulties that may exist will be overcome with normal emphasis and monitoring.

M.3.1.2 Volume II, Price Proposal Evaluation

Cost/price proposals shall be evaluated for completeness by assessing the responsiveness of the proposed cost/price by assessing the level of detail the Offeror provided cost data for all requirements in the SOW, and assessing the traceability of estimates. For the cost data to be complete, the Offeror, or their subcontractors or vendors, must provide all the data necessary to support the offer. The amount of data needed may vary depending on the requirements.

M.3.1.2.1 Completeness and Accuracy

The FAA will review the pricing tables for completeness and accuracy. A determination will be made as to whether the Offeror properly understands the price proposal instructions and properly completed the pricing tables. The Offeror's proposal will be checked for mathematical correctness to include the following:

- Checking calculations in all computations,
- Making sure that all prices are summarized correctly, and
- Comparing electronic submittals with hard copies.

A determination will be made regarding whether the price appears unbalanced either for the total price of the proposal or separately priced line items. An analysis will be made by item, resource, quantity, and year to identify any irregular or unusual pricing patterns. An unbalanced proposal is one that incorporates prices that are less than cost for some items and/or prices that are overstated for other items.

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.3.1.2.2 Price Realism

The Offeror is placed on notice that any proposal that is unrealistic in terms of technical commitment or unrealistically low in cost and/or price will be deemed reflective of an inherent lack of technical competence or indicative of failure to comprehend the complexity and risk of contract requirements, and may be grounds for rejection of the proposal (see Section M.1.3).

M.3.1.2.3 Price Reasonableness

The Offeror is expected to establish a reasonable price relationship between all price/cost elements listed in the price proposal. An evaluation of the Offeror's price proposal will be made to determine if the cost is realistic for the work to be performed, reflects a clear understanding of the requirements, and is consistent with the technical proposal. Reasonableness determinations will be made by determining if competition exists, by comparing bid prices with established commercial or General Services Administration price schedules, and/or by comparing proposed prices with the Independent FAA Cost Estimate.

M.3.1.2.4 Cost Risk

Cost risk refers to any aspect of the Offeror's proposal that could have significant negative cost consequences for the FAA. Each proposal will be assessed to identify potential cost risk. Where cost risk is assessed, it may be described in quantitative terms or used as a best value discriminator. The FAA has determined that Offerors having high level manufacturer certifications (channel partnership levels) are an important factor in evaluating an Offeror's ability to provide the best value-added services required for the contract, such as: experience in deploying and supporting technical solutions, "most favored" pricing, and fast delivery of the right products. Offerors are required to provide their certification levels for the primary manufacturers in the contract. A risk assessment level of Low, Moderate or High will be assigned to the Offeror depending on the number and level of certifications. The assessment rating will be considered in associating a confidence level with the Offeror's ability to perform the work.

M.3.1.3 Volume III, Subcontracting Plan

The Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable. If the plan is determined to be unacceptable, the Offeror will be given an opportunity to revise their original submission of the subcontracting plan during negotiations.

- Pass – Offeror's identifies proposed subcontracting goals consistent with commercial subcontracting goals.
- Fail – Offeror fails to propose goals, or proposed goals consistent with commercial subcontracting goals.

PART IV – SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Offeror's Subcontracting Plan must be acceptable (rated "Pass") in order for the Offeror to be considered for award.

End of Section M